

Appl. No. 09/863,076
Amdt. dated October 3, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 10, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Jueliger (US 5,490,005) for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

Claims 14-17 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Jueliger (US 5,490,005) on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 18-21 were said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as stated in the Office Action.

The claims have been amended as follows. Claim 11 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 18; and claim 18 has been canceled in view of the inclusion of its subject matter into claim 11. Claim 14 is rewritten in independent form, and includes the subject matter of claim 11 as set forth prior to this response. Claim 15 is rewritten in independent form, and includes the subject matter of claim 11 as set forth prior to this response. Claim 17 is rewritten in independent form, and includes the subject matter of claims 11 and 16 as set forth prior to this response. Claim 20 is rewritten in independent form, and includes the subject matter of claims 11, 16 and 17 as

set forth prior to this response. Claims 19 and 21 are made dependent from claim 11.

Claim 11 is believed to be allowable in view of the inclusion of the allowable subject matter of claim 18 in claim 11. Claims 19 and 21 are believed to be allowable in view of their dependency from amended claim 11. Claim 20 was said to have allowable subject matter, and should be allowable in independent form.

Claim 14 is believed to be distinguishable over Juelinger who shows in Fig. 4 a translector, which guides light in the direction from light source 21 to the LCD 3. This translector can not be made white and highly reflective since then it would only reflect and not transfect. So the person skilled in the art would not use a white, highly reflective coating (11) from Juelinger.

Claim 15 is believed to be distinguishable over Juelinger who does not describe any analogue instrument. A skilled artisan has no reason to illuminate both instruments with one light-guiding plate since it was and is common to illuminate different instruments separately.

Claim 17 is believed to be distinguishable over Juelinger. LED/s emitting white light are novel and not common to a person skilled in the art so that it was not obvious to use such elements for the illumination of a combination instrument.

The remaining claims are believed to be allowable in view of their dependency from claim 11, as amended.


Deposit Account Charge forms are presented in the amount of \$172.00 to cover the Government fee for two extra independent claims in excess of 3 independent claims.

In the event there are further issues remaining the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone attorney to reach agreement to expedite issuance of this application.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
Jürgen Adams


by: 
Martin A. Farber
Attorney for Applicant
Registered Representative
Registration No. 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR SECTION 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the accompanying Amendment and Deposit Account Charge are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 3, 2003.

Dated: October 3, 2003

866 United Nations Plaza
Suite 473
New York, NY 10017
(212) 758-2878


MARTIN A. FARBER